Iowa Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant: Year 1 Final Report

May 2007

Submitted to:
Mary Beth Schroeder-Fracek
Iowa Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146

Melissa Brown-Sims
Cortney Rowland
Susan Sexton
Kenneth Smith

LEARNING POINT
Associates®

Contents

Introduction and Background

In the fall of 2004, the Iowa Department of Education applied for a three-year U.S. Department of Education-sponsored Teacher Quality Enhancement (TQE) grant to strengthen teacher education through reforms that hold teacher preparation programs accountable, improve prospective teachers' knowledge of academic content, and ensure that teachers are well prepared for the realities of the classroom. The grant was subsequently awarded, and grant implementation began in October 2005. The grant is now in its second year, allowing the evaluation team to analyze data from the first year and one half of the implementation activities. Hence, this report serves as the first annual report to the Iowa Department of Education and, more specifically, the Iowa Teacher Quality Enhancement Team, preceded only by the Year 1 Interim Evaluation report dated November 2006.

The mission of Iowa's TQE program is to reform and enhance the teaching capacities of Iowa's future teachers so that every Iowa child will have access to the highest quality education possible. The Iowa Department of Education aims specifically to enhance the quality of new teachers who enter the profession upon graduation from Iowa-based colleges and universities. The grant implementation team aims to do this by focusing on seven core areas (managed by seven unique teams): reading and writing in the content areas, middle-level content, English language learners, assessment, dispositions assessment, cross-institutional articulation, and collaboration.

The seven teams are organized around four project goals that are designed to focus on improving various aspects of teacher preparation. While each team operates independently of the others, each team's work complements the goals of the others in order to collectively strengthen the spectrum of teacher preparation activities.

The four project goals and respective team alignment are outlined here.

Goal 1: Strengthen Teaching in the Content Areas

The Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team is working to strengthen the teaching of reading and writing in the content areas. The team is solely focused on developing models and building the capacity of content-area teacher educators, teacher candidates, and teachers in using research-based instructional strategies.

The Middle-Level Content Team is working to strengthen teaching in the content areas so that middle school teachers enter the profession equipped to succeed with students whose grade-level needs are just as unique as elementary and high school. In the end, the team plans to establish a middle school endorsement that would be awarded to teachers who meet articulated requirements for middle grades—in essence, this endorsement would be a signal to hiring authorities that particular teachers meet a new standard for teaching middle grades subjects.

Although not a component of this Year 1 evaluation due to its relative newness, the Language Arts Team also is working toward the objectives of Goal 1, including strengthening the core content requirements for secondary teachers. The Language Arts Team reviewed the

requirements for endorsements for English, speech, and journalism and found an overlap in the requirements and thus decided to broaden and strengthen the knowledge-base requirements for English teachers in Iowa. The team developed the Language Arts endorsement based on the standards of the national content networks for each discipline. Further evaluation of the Language Arts Team will be included in subsequent reports.

Goal 2: Improve Teaching for Diverse Populations

The English Language Learners Team focuses on improving instructional quality and increasing the extent to which technology is used to facilitate that process.

Goal 3: Reform and Improvement Through Analysis

The Assessment Team is developing evaluation tools to measure new teacher effectiveness, creating assessments to identify the strengths and weaknesses in the preparation of first- and second-year teachers as well as developing the capacity of teacher education programs to regularly gather, manage, and analyze teacher performance data.

The Dispositions Assessment Team is researching and creating effective techniques for assessing ethical and professional behaviors (dispositions) of teacher education candidates with the goal of developing a statewide model.

The Cross-Institutional Articulation Team is working to organize and facilitate conversations between two-year and four-year colleges of teacher education. Specifically, the team is working to create a statewide cross-articulation agreement that strengthens mathematics and oral/written communication skills of preservice teacher candidates, establishes basic competency testing, and eliminates transfer barriers between two-year and four-year colleges.

Goal 4: Meeting Future Challenges Through Collaboration

The Collaborative Plus Team focuses on developing and facilitating collaborations that allow teachers to serve the needs of all students, particularly those with disabilities, gifted and talented students, English language learners, and students who are considered or have the potential for being at risk. It is worth noting here that the grant implementation team has incorporated the work of Iowa's Induction and Mentoring program to help contribute to the objectives of Goal 4, but the Induction and Mentoring work will not be part of the evaluation efforts at Learning Point Associates.

Learning Point Associates—an Illinois-based, nonprofit education research and professional services organization—was contracted to conduct an evaluation of the grant implementation activities. The English language learners evaluation (Goal 2) is being conducted entirely by Don Yarbrough and his colleagues at the University of Iowa. The Learning Point Associates evaluation team is working in partnership with the English language learners evaluation team to ensure complementary approaches to the individual evaluations. The English language learners evaluation discussion and findings are included in a separate report focusing on the same time period.

The evaluation plans that guide the work of Learning Point Associates and the University of Iowa were written specifically to measure the project implementation goals developed by the Iowa Department of Education and to ensure the fidelity of the evaluation across all three years of the grant.

To understand how Iowa has created and implemented interventions to promote improvements in the teaching capacities of Iowa's future teachers who graduate from Iowa colleges and universities, the following research questions provide the framework for the evaluation:

1. To what extent has Iowa strengthened teaching in the content areas for those who seek to enter the profession of teaching?

2. Has Iowa better prepared new teachers to support and teach diverse student populations, specifically targeting English language learners?

3. What has Iowa done to reform teacher education programs to make them more effective through rigorous analysis of candidates and program performance data?

4. Through collaboration, to what extent is Iowa meeting future challenges to help new teachers meet the educational demands for the 21st century?

Learning Point Associates is using both formative and summative assessments during the three-year grant period to monitor project implementation and to determine overall project quality, merit, and worth in relation to project goals and expectations specifically related to Research Questions 1, 3, and 4. As previously mentioned, Research Question 2 is being evaluated by the University of Iowa. Essentially, the evaluation will measure interventions designed to promote improvements in the quality of new teachers through comprehensive statewide reform activities.

This first annual report spans the implementation activities in Year 1 as well as the first half of Year 2. It begins with an overview of the evaluation methods and processes, followed by a discussion of the accomplishments and findings associated with the six teams falling under the Learning Point Associates evaluation umbrella. Further, complementary findings across the teams are presented, including facilitators and barriers associated with implementation and a discussion about collaboration within and among the teams. The report concludes with recommendations and a plan for next steps.

Evaluation Methods

Data for this report were collected during the winter of 2006–07 and the spring of 2007 through interviews with team members and other stakeholders, document reviews, and a survey. Progress monitoring also was used to evaluate team activities. The evaluation team chose a multimethod approach to examine the various activities of the TQE teams as well as to garner a variety of data to illustrate the extent to which the teams are reaching their individual goals and contributing to the larger grant goals. The methods of data collection are described here. The results of the analyzed data are provided in the Evaluation Findings section of this report.

Interviews

The Learning Point Associates evaluation team conducted a total of 31 telephone interviews across the six TQE teams and the grant director. The team purposefully selected team members and stakeholders for potential interviews, and the final number is the result of those who agreed to be interviewed. While the distribution of interviews across teams is not equal, it is important to acknowledge that teams vary in size (causing the pool of potential interviewees to be much smaller for some teams) and not all team members were available for interviews within the data collection time period. The main goal of the interviews was to inquire about the extent to which the TQE teams are meeting specific team goals and objectives as well as the grant's overall goals. The evaluation team used a total of 10 different protocols to conduct the interviews, which can be found in Appendix A. The different protocols were used in order to interview team members and stakeholders about team activities and objectives that were relevant to their specific experiences. Table 1 lists the groups that were interviewed and the number of interviews conducted for each group.

Table 1. Interviews Conducted by Evaluation Team

Team	Number of Interviews
Assessment Team	1
Assessment Team grant awardees—first round	2
Collaborative Plus Team	6
Cross-Institutional Articulation Team	6
Cross-Institutional Articulation Team survey participants	2
Dispositions Assessment Team	3
Grant Director	1
Middle-Level Content Team	3
Middle-Level Content Team grant awardees	2
Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team	3
Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team match-up	2
TOTAL	**31**

Document Review

The evaluation team reviewed 10 key documents generated and submitted by the following TQE teams: the Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team, the Middle-Level Content Team, and the Assessment Team. There were no documents readily available for review from the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team or the Collaborative Plus Team for this report, although there will be documents for review from these teams for later reports. Although the Dispositions Assessment Team has created its Conceptual Framework document, the evaluation team decided not to review the document until team members have an opportunity to revise and incorporate the feedback they receive from the advisory committee. The evaluation team plans on reviewing a final draft of the Conceptual Framework document in preparation for the November 2007 interim report.

The evaluation team revised the original document review rubric (revised rubric can be found in Appendix C) used for the November 2006 interim report. The rubric was revised to more accurately align with TQE goals as well as the goals of each team. The following documents were reviewed:

- Assessment Team: Scoring Rubric for Four-Year Colleges and University Assessment System Proposals

- Assessment Team: Scoring Rubric for Community College Assessment System Proposals

- Middle-Level Content Team: Mid-Term Report from the Des Moines Public School

- Middle-Level Content Team: Mid-Term Report from Gilbert Middle School

- Middle-Level Content Team: Mid-Term Report from Luther College and Decorah Middle School

- Middle-Level Content Team: Mid-Term Report from Clark College

- Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team: (1) Proposal Announcement Letter and (2) Request for Proposal for Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers.

- Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team: (1) Proposal Announcement Letter and (2) Request for Proposal for Teacher Education Chairs and Faculty Members.

Criteria in the rubric represent TQE grant goals as well as individual team objectives, both of which the evaluation team expects to see reflected in team documents. Rubric criteria on which documents were evaluated include the following:

- Communication.

- Establishing partnerships.

- Practical and/or feasible implementation.

- Strengthening teaching in the content areas.

- Reform teacher education programs through analysis of candidates and program performance data.

- Raises standards and/or accountability for institutions of higher education, administrators, students, or teachers.
- Professional development.
- Assessment.

Some criteria present in the rubric are not relevant for some TQE teams and the teams' respective documents. In this case, criteria were marked as Not Applicable (N/A) and did not apply to the final review score. To ensure interrater reliability, two members of the evaluation team evaluated each document individually using the rubric and then compared results and worked to obtain consensus on rating scores.

Survey

Between March 15, 2007, and April 5, 2007, the evaluation team at Learning Point Associates conducted an online survey of the individuals who participated in the February 19, 2007, Cross-Institutional Articulation Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) alignment meeting to ascertain participants' experiences and perspectives regarding the work and initiatives of the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team. Survey questions consisted of multiple choice, open ended, and several Likert-scaled questions that asked participants questions such as how many times they participated in the various INTASC alignment meetings, the effectiveness of the meetings, the extent to which they believe the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team would be successful in meeting its objectives, and the barriers and facilitators to implementing a statewide articulation agreement. The complete survey protocol can be found in Appendix B. At the end of the survey, participants were asked if they would be willing to participate in a brief 10-minute phone interview so the evaluation team could obtain more in-depth feedback on their viewpoints.

The evaluation team created the 26-item survey using Zoomerang, an online survey software package. Through e-mail, the evaluation team sent a link for the survey to approximately 40 individuals. Survey respondents included associate and assistant professors; deans; and technology and educational coordinators with backgrounds in early education, educational psychology, science, child development, and educational research and evaluation. The survey completion rate was 45 percent ($n = 18$). Five individuals (12.5 percent) stated that they had not attended the February 19, 2007, meeting and declined to complete the survey. The remaining 42.5 percent ($n = 17$) were identified as nonresponders. In order to avoid attaining biased results, the evaluation team did not request members of the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team to participate in the survey. A total of three weekly follow-up e-mails reminded and encouraged participants to complete the survey. Due to the initial low response rate, the evaluation team extended the original deadline to give participants extra time to complete the survey.

Evaluation Findings

The presentation of evaluation findings is organized according to the three primary research questions being examined by the evaluation team: Research Questions 1, 3, and 4. These questions were listed in the Introduction and Background section. For information about Research Question 2, see the evaluation report submitted by the University of Iowa. Each of the following sections includes team status updates as well as interview and/or survey findings for the team(s) whose goals contribute to the specific research question. Sections conclude with a discussion about the extent to which the research question is being met as well as an overview of the federal indicators applicable to some of the teams' work.

Information contained in this report represents evaluation findings to date for the period November 1, 2006, to May 15, 2007.

Research Question 1: To What Extent Has Iowa Strengthened Teaching in the Content Areas for Those Who Seek to Enter the Profession of Teaching?

Work that falls under this question is primarily being addressed by the Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team as well as the Middle-Level Content Team. Following are status updates for each one of those teams as well as results from data-collection activities conducted by the evaluation team as they relate to those two teams.

Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team

Status Update. Since the November 2006 interim report, the Reading and Writing Team continues to formally documenting the results of last year's survey, which asked area education agencies (AEAs) and institutions of higher education (IHEs) about their methods of instruction and/or inservice training related to reading and writing in the content areas. Once the write-up of the results is complete, the team hopes to post its findings on the Iowa Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (IACTE) and the Iowa Department of Education websites.

The Reading and Writing team has decided to focus its efforts on the research-based Question-Answer Relationships (QAR) technique, which helps students respond to questions by using reading passages in various ways. The team recently released a request for proposal (RFP) for IHEs and school districts notifying them of two separate, three-day summer institutes that will train educators (preferably teams, although that is not required with this RFP) on how to use QAR as well as provide funding to ensure their attendance at these institutes. To participate in the summer institutes, applicants must agree to attend not only the three-day sessions but also three follow-up sessions that will be held throughout the 2007–08 school year. Finally, to garner the support and participation of IHEs, the Reading and Writing Team contacted several of them personally and encouraged them to apply. The team has temporarily tabled work on the development and dissemination of resource-related materials (e.g., course syllabi, books) for Grades 7–12 teachers, teacher educators, and teacher candidates.

Interview Findings for the Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team and Match-up.
The evaluation team interviewed three members of the Reading and Writing Team as well as two

individuals who participate in the school-university match-up. They shared a number of challenges, facilitators, accomplishments, and goals for their work. More than one interviewee mentioned that communication issues hampered much of the success of Year 1 work. For example, team members felt that the lack of interest in their proposed school-university partnerships, which were to focus on learning and implementing QAR techniques both in the school classroom and the higher education classroom, was mostly a result of delayed invitations and applications as well as a lack of personal contact. The team is attempting to remedy communication issues for this year's work by making personal phone calls to potential higher education faculty participants for the summer institutes.

Creating partnerships, which is a main goal of the TQE grant, also has been difficult for the Reading and Writing Team. The single school-university partnership that took place during last year's work has been implemented at one high school with three teachers. An interviewee noted that these teachers really have bought into the strategy and believe in its effectiveness. However, the professor from the university side of the partnership was already using the QAR technique so it is unlikely that it has expanded in university classrooms (beyond her previous use of QAR) as a result of TQE efforts. Interviewees mentioned that the overall objective of the match-up was to have the school learn and implement QAR and then serve as an opportunity for the university to place practicum students and "feel better about the quality of teaching." While some of the teachers at the school are being taught QAR, according to one interviewee the placement of teacher candidates "really didn't happen." Two barriers mentioned by interviewees to the school-university component of the Reading and Writing Team's work were the difficulty in securing time for folks to convene and the need for an administrator to be on board from the program's inception to the end.

In terms of factors that facilitated the team's work last year, team members mentioned the ability to be informed of the work occurring within the other teams (referencing last year's June meeting in Perry, Iowa) and the solid research base of the reading strategy on which they focus their work (QAR). The Reading and Writing Team interviewees noted that strengthening partnerships is a main goal for this year's work; however, since the partnership stipulation was removed from the RFP for this summer's institutes, it may be more difficult than expected. The team actually issued two different RFPs, one strictly for higher education and one strictly for K–12. The team hopes to have a successful level of participation for the summer institutes, although a specific participation rate was not mentioned. One major accomplishment shared by the interviewees was the team's ability to make midcourse adjustments as a result of last year's experiences. Despite the lack of success with the original school-university match-up plans, the team came together to devise new plans, which include this summer's institutes.

Middle-Level Content Team

Status Update. Since the November 2006 interim report, the Middle-Level Content Team has completed the survey it administered last fall, asking teachers and administrators about their beliefs regarding the best middle school teaching practices. In addition, the team developed a draft of the new middle school endorsements that will be up for approval this year. Because of inclement weather, representatives of the team were unable to present the middle school endorsement recommendations to the Board of Educational Examiners at the March 2007 meeting but will have the opportunity to do so in May 2007.

In terms of the four grantees that have been working on district-university collaborations to improve middle school preparation and instruction, each grantee delivered a midyear report this year. The Middle-Level Content Team plans to develop methods for ensuring that the partnerships share the details of their collaboration, such as content or curriculum, with surrounding districts and universities. One idea that the Middle-Level Content Team has for achieving that goal is to host a teacher's academy where IHEs will have the opportunity to learn about the four collaborative models.

Interview Findings for the Middle-Level Content Team. The evaluation team interviewed three members of the Middle-Level Content Team and encountered several common themes. Interviewees all thought that the team, more or less, is meeting its objective of strengthening the skills of new middle school teachers. One interviewee mentioned that it is difficult to determine the extent to which the objective is met until the new middle school endorsements are put into practice. Furthermore, interviewees recognize that middle-level teachers really need to know *how* to teach middle-grade students. One interviewee mentioned, "In addition to the content, we're also adding depth and breadth to understanding the middle-school-aged child." Team members also see this work as meeting the objective of potentially filling teacher shortage areas in Iowa. One interviewee pointed out that "the potential for this group's work is to broaden the skills and talents of preservice teachers, so that we get highly qualified math, and/or let's say science, teachers to come to our schools." Nonetheless, interviewees recognize that the implementation of the new middle-level endorsements will require changes on behalf of the universities. They are confident the endorsements will be overall well received.

Interviewees noted that a facilitator for their work was leadership. Interviewees mentioned the grant director and the Middle-Level Content Team cochairs as vital members of the group who ease the consensus-making process. The team's primary goal for this year is to secure the new endorsements. This requires going through the state rule-making process. The team appears to have less of a focus on the district-university collaborations at this point. Team members recognize that for others to grow similar collaborative efforts, the team will have to develop a communication plan that can be shared with other districts and universities and provide time for that sharing to take place. One interviewee noted that the potentially biggest barrier to this part of the work is getting people "who are willing to collaborate at the public school or private school level with their local college or university, [to] be able to give up some sacred cows—be able to hear some honest biases or criticisms—to build a better system."

Interview Findings for the Middle-Level Content Team Grantees. Similar to those on the Middle-Level Content Team, interviewees representing the Middle-Level Content Team grantees mentioned that the objective of the grant is to "improve preteaching development, improve the training of preservice teachers, teacher candidates. And an added benefit, of course, is that we get the best teacher candidates because we know who they are." Middle-Level Content Team grantees also recognize that in order for the sustained impact of these collaborations to be successful, "a lot of it will rest on whether the few people who believe in it now can share that with other people at the university." While some mentioned that the grant has been a lot of work to maintain, most also note that overall it has been a facilitating factor in helping the state convene discussions and develop work plans around this very topic. One interviewee reported that the grant funds "allowed us to go and get the training that we need to speed up that process

because we probably wouldn't have been able to go to that conference if it hadn't been for grant funds." The stipulation in the grant that requires collaboration also has been a facilitator, as one interviewee notes, "We have to collaborate with other entities. And that's a good thing. It makes us do it because it's easier not to."

Discussion of Research Question 1

While overall the Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team and the Middle-Level Content Team are moving work forward to strengthen teaching in the content areas, a lack of participation by stakeholders for the Reading and Writing Team initiatives has somewhat hindered the overall success of this goal. The results of the Reading and Writing Team's midcourse corrections to remedy issues related to the lack of participation remain to be seen. An interviewee from a different Iowa TQE team mentioned that she felt as though her team's success was due in part to the fact that the team was responding to a real need in the field. It is possible that stakeholders for the particular initiatives offered by the Reading and Writing Team did not consider this to be the case. However, the forthcoming summer institutes may address that. Team members across the TQE grant stressed the importance of creating buy-in among stakeholders and getting assistance from key contacts (even those not affiliated with the grant) to develop and disseminate work. For example, the Middle-Level Content Team expended a great deal of time presenting drafts of the middle school endorsements to various stakeholder groups in order to garner feedback. Last, where appropriate, the Middle-Level Content Team and the Reading and Writing Team may consider collaborating or partnering on activities that seek to work toward the same goal.

Federal Indicators

Work pertaining to Goal 1 (strengthen teaching in the content areas) aligns with a few federal program goals. They include the following:

- **Student Achievement.** "Graduating teacher education students, having completed the reformed teacher education program will possess improved skills related to teacher content areas, which will in turn translate into a sustained and measurable increase in student learning" (Title II, Section 206 [a][1], Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant).

- **Core Academic Subjects.** "Teachers in schools receiving Middle School grants will demonstrate competence through a high level of performance in reading, math, and science. Higher education institutions will incorporate results from the models into education courses on reading, math, and science" (Title II, Section 206 [a][4], Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant).

- **Teacher Shortages.** "Teachers in schools of Iowa's Enterprise Community, a poor, urban school district, and rural districts who are participating in the Middle School model program will be more likely to stay in the teaching profession as a teacher of math or science, increasing the total percentage of teachers in two of Iowa's shortages areas" (Title II, Section 206 [a][5], Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant).

Relative success at meeting these federal program goals is measured by target and performance data. The Learning Point Associates evaluation team will not collect or analyze student

achievement data as part of evaluation efforts. Target and performance data to measure the success of the other program goals are not available at this point in the TQE grant.

Research Question 3: What Has Iowa Done to Reform Teacher Education Programs to Make Them More Effective Through Rigorous Analysis of Candidates and Program Performance Data?

Work toward this evaluation question is primarily being addressed by the Assessment Team, the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team, and the Dispositions Assessment Team. Status updates for each team follow as well as results from data-collection efforts focused on those three teams.

Assessment Team

Status Update. Since Learning Point Associated wrote the November 2006 Interim Report, the Assessment Team has concluded its first round of RFPs. During this initial round, IHEs were encouraged to work by themselves as well as in collaboration with other institutions to develop electronic data-collection and management systems to improve the preparation of teachers in Iowa. Examples of the types of data-collection systems being implemented throughout the state as a result of the first round of proposals include the development of several electronic portfolio systems that will track, monitor, and exhibit student teachers' work during their tenure as undergraduates and the creation of a performance-assessment database that will enable education faculty members to monitor the progress and outcomes of their students, provide accountability for student performance, and supply constant feedback to education faculty for program improvement. According to the RFP, all grantees are required to submit a final report to the Assessment Team detailing the status and implementation of their electronic data systems.

To continue working toward the achievement of the team's grant goal of "developing the capacity of teacher education programs to gather, manage, and analyze performance data to improve teacher education," the Assessment Team disseminated, collected, reviewed, and announced the winners for its second-round RFP. During this cycle, awardees could use the grant funds to help provide faculty development and training, design or modify performance tasks, develop procedures for ensuring the reliability and validity of assessments, and/or buy database software or hardware to facilitate data management and reporting. To help diversify and include all stakeholders, the team strongly encouraged community colleges to apply and collaborate with each other as well as with four-year private and regent institutions. Moreover, to increase the applicant pool, institutions awarded funds during the first round were not excluded from reapplying as long as they had met the requirements set forth in their original contract.

To garner participation for this new endeavor, the Assessment Team posted information about the second-round RFP on the Iowa Department of Education website in addition to making a presentation at the Cross-Institutional Articulation INTASC meeting, where community colleges, private institutions, and regent universities from across Iowa were in attendance. For the second round of RFPs, the Assessment Team developed and utilized two scoring rubrics—one for community colleges and another for four-year institutions—to ensure fair and accurate evaluations of all proposals submitted.

In conjunction with the institution-by-institution database established in 2006, the state has already begun the initial acquisition of the names and addresses of teacher preparation program alumni who are in their first, second, and third year of teaching as well as their employers—and the distribution of those data back to the preparing institutions of those alumni. Unfortunately, the state did not provide the e-mail addresses of the alumni to these schools. It is now the responsibility of the institutions to manually locate the e-mail addresses by searching school websites and contacting these individuals to see if they would be willing to participate in follow-up surveys.

Future work for the Assessment Team during this year includes hosting and facilitating an assessment summit planned for June 2007 for those institutions that are interested or that are already working on developing assessment systems. The purpose of this summit is to provide a place where stakeholders can learn, collaborate, and share ideas, materials, and research on ways to improve the assessment of teacher candidates. Other efforts include monitoring the implementation of the second-round proposals and continuing to work with the Iowa Department of Education to ensure the delivery of names and addresses of alumni to their preparing institutions.

Interview Findings for the Assessment Team. To determine whether the Assessment Team is accomplishing the goal of reforming and improving teacher education programs through rigorous analysis of candidate and program performance data, the evaluation team conducted interviews with one member of the Assessment Team as well as a randomly selected group of first-round grantees. The Assessment Team has used the grant funds to select and support the development and implementation of more than two dozen data management and collection systems in institutions across Iowa as well as the development of an institution-by-institution database that will allow teacher preparation programs to track and survey their graduates. The team has kept in constant communication with these schools by helping to provide them with the necessary assistance they need. As a result, the team's leader has received high praise. One grantee states, "He is very knowledgeable about what we need to do and how we might do it … and I just think he as a person—his personality is such that he likes people to participate."

Despite the success the team has had in working toward its goals, interviewees also identified a few barriers. These include the following:

- Lack of understanding the assessment work.
- Little collaboration with other TQE teams.
- Pressure to have all data management and collection systems in electronic format.
- Lack of time.
- Difficulty building consensus.

The team seems to face the challenge of persuading some institutions of the importance of the work. With the diversity of teacher preparation programs throughout Iowa, the Assessment Team— as well as those who have been afforded the responsibility of implementing a new or improved data management and collection system at their institutions—often find it difficult to reach consensus on a variety of topics. For example, some institutions are reluctant to acquire an all-electronic

method of tracking the progress of students. These institutions prefer a mixture of computers and paper-and-pencil methods for fear that they may lose the "human interaction" component.

Cross-Institutional Articulation Team

Status Update. Since the November 2006 interim report, the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team has hosted the second of three scheduled INTASC alignment meetings. At the February 2007 meeting, approximately 40 individuals representing community colleges, regent institutions, private colleges, and four-year institutions were in attendance. The purpose of this meeting was to provide a "forum for four-year and two-year institutions to work together on articulation issues, using the paradigm that educators can find common ground concerning student learning outcomes, based upon imbedded INTASC standards, to provide a basis for consensus-building on what knowledge, skills, and dispositions should be taught and assessed during the first two years of college preparation of potential teacher candidates." At this meeting, participating institutions discussed the pros, cons, and support mechanisms needed to create a statewide articulation agreement among all IHEs in Iowa. Participants also were asked to identify the skills, knowledge, experiences, and dispositions an "ideal" teacher candidate would possess as well as the types of barriers they experience with transfer students.

The Cross-Institutional Articulation Team is cognizant of the fact that the development and implementation of the statewide articulation agreement may span beyond the three years of this grant. However, during this time, the team is diligently working with two- and four-year institutions to help identify and come to agreement on which courses and standards teacher candidates should be able to demonstrate and transport as they move between institutions. This delicate and important work is done even as institutions try to maintain their individual autonomy.

In terms of the team's goal to create a statewide agreement on basic competency tests, the team is still working to gain consensus from many two- and four-year institutions as to which of the three competency tests (i.e., Praxis I: Pre-Professional Skills Test [PPST], College Basic Academic Subjects Examination [C-BASE], or Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency [CAAP]) and respective cut-off scores they would be willing to accept. Some institutions have agreed to accept all three tests, and several have decided to accept only one or two and in some rare cases none of the exams.

In an effort to work toward their fourth goal of strengthening the mathematics and oral/written communication skills of preservice candidates, the team has actively initiated conversations with two- and four-year institutions and some arts and science faculty through the INTASC alignment meetings about how to meet the needs of teacher education candidates.

Work on the team's final goal of "researching successful articulation factors and barriers for students transferring from Iowa two-year to four-year and four-year to four-year colleges into education programs" has yet to commence; it is slated to begin before the end of 2007.

Future work for the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team includes hosting a third INTASC alignment meeting at which it hopes to bring together even more community colleges, four-year institutions, private colleges, and regent universities to discuss the creation of a statewide articulation agreement and how to bring and include arts and science faculty into the discussion.

Other efforts to be conducted by the team this year include designing, identifying, disseminating, and presenting the results of the survey and focus-group findings on the articulation facilitators and barriers of transfer students as well as helping to establish consensus among institutions on the acceptance of the PPST, C-BASE, and CAAP competency tests.

Results for the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team Survey. The following section summarizes select findings from the online survey assessing the work and impact of the February 2007 INTASC alignment meeting as a reflection of the efforts of the articulation team. Because of the small sample size ($N = 18$), these results should be read with caution. They are not intended to provide a representative view of all institutions and how they feel toward the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team and its initiatives; rather, the results should be used to help provide a snapshot of the situation in which the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team does its work.

Survey respondents represented a diverse group of professionals from different sectors of higher education in the state. Fifty percent of respondents identified themselves as affiliated with community colleges, 33 percent represented regent universities, and 17 percent private institutions. Approximately 67 percent of survey respondents were faculty outside arts and sciences departments at their institutions. The remaining 33 percent were members of the arts and sciences faculty at their institutions. The majority of attendees (61 percent) at the February meeting did not participate in the previous INTASC alignment meeting hosted by the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team. When asked to describe how they heard about the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team and the February INTASC alignment meeting, respondents indicated that e-mail was the primary method.

Respondents were asked to judge the effectiveness of the February 2007 INTASC alignment meeting in providing respondents with an opportunity to meet, discuss, and collaborate with members of other teacher preparation programs in Iowa. Eighty-three percent of respondents felt the February meeting was either "very effective" or "somewhat effective" in providing those opportunities. Eleven percent found the meeting to be "somewhat ineffective," and 6 percent stated that they did not participate in the meeting. These results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Effectiveness of the February 2007 INTASC Alignment Meeting

How effective was the February 19, 2007, INTASC alignment meeting in terms of providing you with an opportunity to meet, discuss, and collaborate with members of other teacher preparation programs in Iowa?	Percentage	*N*
Very effective	44%	8
Somewhat effective	39%	7
Somewhat ineffective	11%	2
Very ineffective	0%	0
Did not participate	6%	1

To assess the work of the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team in its ability to meet its goal of creating a statewide articulation agreement, survey respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the following statement: "The Cross-Articulation Team is meeting its goal of creating a

statewide articulation agreement among two- and four-year colleges of teacher preparation." Results can be found in Table 3. More than 70 percent of respondents said that they either "strongly agree" or "somewhat agree" with the statement.

Table 3. Cross-Institutional Articulation Team's Ability to Achieve Its Goal

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement? "The Cross-Institutional Articulation Team is meeting its goal of creating a statewide articulation agreement among two- and four-year colleges of teacher preparation."	Percentage	*N*
Strongly agree	17%	3
Somewhat agree	61%	11
Somewhat disagree	22%	4
Strongly disagree	0%	0

When asked how successful the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team will be in achieving its goal of creating a statewide articulation agreement by spring 2008, 22 percent responded "very successful," and 56 percent responded "somewhat successful." The remaining 23 percent responded that the team would be "somewhat unsuccessful" or "very unsuccessful." Results are in Table 4.

Table 4. Ability of Team to Establish a Statewide Articulation Agreement by Spring 2008

How successful do you think the Cross-Articulation Team will be in achieving its goal of creating a statewide articulation agreement by spring 2008?	Percentage	*N*
Very successful	22%	4
Somewhat successful	56%	10
Somewhat unsuccessful	17%	3
Very unsuccessful	6%	1

Results of this survey show that meeting participants perceive a general lack of communication between education and arts and sciences faculties within many of Iowa's universities. Among respondents, 59 percent stated that the two entities "rarely" communicate and collaborate with one another. Further results are in Table 5.

Table 5. Communication and Collaboration Between Education Faculty and Arts and Science Faculty—Part 1

Rate how often the education faculty and the arts and sciences faculty at your institution communicate and collaborate with each other.	Percentage	*N*
All of the time	12%	2
Most of the time	29%	5
Rarely	59%	10
Never	0%	0

To explore the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team's impact on the communication and collaboration between education and arts and sciences faculties, respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the following statement: "The Cross-Institutional Articulation Team's work has helped to improve the communication and collaboration between the arts and sciences faculty and the education faculty at my university." Results to this question are difficult to interpret as half of respondents stated that they "strongly agree" or "somewhat agree" while the other half responded that they "somewhat disagree" or "strongly disagree." Results are detailed in Table 6.

Table 6. Communication and Collaboration Between
Education Faculty and Arts and Science Faculty—Part 2

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement? "The Cross-Institutional Articulation Team's work has helped to improve the communication and collaboration between the arts and sciences faculty and the education faculty at my university."	Percentage	*N*
Strongly agree	12%	2
Somewhat agree	38%	6
Somewhat disagree	38%	6
Strongly disagree	12%	2

Barriers to Developing, Implementing, or Sustaining a Statewide Articulation Agreement. When asked in open-ended questions to describe some of the barriers to implementing an articulation agreement between two- and four-year institutions, respondents provided answers such as the following:

- Both two- and four-year institutions are very territorial in nature and have been resistant to change. A sense of "inertia" has existed between both entities, making them both reluctant to change.

- Four-year institutions appear to be unwilling to participate in the articulation agreement. A lack of trust exists in the quality of community colleges' faculties and coursework.

- The time and resource commitment that must be committed to the tasks associated with establishing articulation agreements are perceived as too great and also serve to restrict the ability of both entities to create articulation agreements.

Facilitators to Developing, Implementing, or Sustaining a Statewide Articulation Agreement. On the other hand, respondents also shared what might be helpful to the process of establishing an articulation agreement. These suggestions included the following:

- State support from the Department of Education playing a lead role in gaining cooperation between two- and four-year institutions.

- Active participation and support from the various school entities—from the dean to the professors: Faculty members from both two-and four-year institutions must be involved in the process of establishing content goals, standards, and the requirements that should compose the articulation agreement.

- Greater collaboration and communication between entities on the components of the articulation agreement as well as creating consensus on requirements.

Top Three Benefits of Having a Statewide Articulation Agreement. Respondents also identified some of the ways as follows in which an articulation agreement might be beneficial:

- Students will benefit from an easier transition between two- and four-year institutions as well as a more consistent knowledge base.

- A statewide articulation agreement would improve teacher education by creating greater consistency among teacher education programs.

- A statewide articulation agreement would be better for institutions because it would create clear programmatic outcome expectations and goals.

Respondents exhibited strong support for the creation of a statewide articulation agreement. Seventy-two percent were "very supportive" of a statewide articulation agreement, while 28 percent were "somewhat supportive." None of the respondents showed a lack of support for the development of an articulation agreement. Table 7 shows the response breakout.

Table 7. Support for Creation of a Statewide Articulation Agreement

How supportive are you of the creation of a statewide articulation agreement?	Percentage	*N*
Very supportive	72%	13
Somewhat supportive	28%	5
Somewhat unsupportive	0%	0
Very unsupportive	0%	0

When asked who should be involved in discussions related to a statewide articulation agreement, respondents mentioned roles such as education faculty, IHE administrators, transfer students, arts and sciences faculty, and policymakers. Table 8 provides results.

Table 8. Whom to Involve in Further Discussion on Articulation Agreements

In your opinion, which other parties should be included in these face-to-face talks regarding the statewide articulation agreement? (Select all that apply.)	Percentage	*N*
Education faculty members at community colleges, four-year institutions, and regent universities	100%	16
IHE administrators	81%	13
Teacher preparation transfer students	75%	12
Arts and sciences faculty	69%	11
State legislators and policymakers	62%	10
School principals	44%	7
Parents and families	19%	3
Technology teachers	12%	2
IHE student body at large	12%	2

Summary of Survey Responses. The results of this survey reveal that 50 percent of the respondents represent community colleges, while 50 percent represent four-year and regent institutions. Only one third of respondents identified themselves as arts and science faculty members. Survey participants believe that INTASC alignment meetings are effective in terms of providing respondents with an opportunity to meet, discuss, and collaborate with other teacher preparation programs. Moreover, a large proportion of the respondents also believe that the team will be fairly successful in achieving its goal of creating a statewide articulation, particularly by spring 2008. Likewise, many respondents note that they are eager and supportive of this initiative. In terms of including arts and science faculty in the articulation agreement discussion, the vast majority of respondents (69 percent) believe their participation is critical.

In addition to garnering support of arts and science faculty, respondents feel that the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team as well as the IHEs as a whole will have to overcome several barriers if they want to successfully develop and implement a statewide articulation agreement. These barriers include a lack of communication and collaboration, turf wars, and insufficient trust between two- and four-year institutions. In order to surmount these challenges, respondents feel that greater collaboration and communication are warranted, participation from every party within each institution should be involved, and support should come from the Iowa Department of Education in terms of helping to garner the cooperation of two- and four-year institutions.

Interview Findings for the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team. In order to determine if the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team is achieving its goal of reforming and improving teacher education programs through rigorous analysis of candidate and program performance data, the evaluation team conducted interviews with several members of the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team and a subset of the survey participants. The Cross-Institutional Articulation Team has eagerly begun to open the lines of communication between two- and four-year institutions about the needs of education students in Iowa. The team has received support from community colleges and some four-year institutions, such as the University of Northern Iowa, Iowa State, and the University of Iowa. Many of the interviewees were able to see how the creation of a statewide articulation agreement would have a long-term and positive impact on not only the students but the IHEs as well. Finally, one respondent acknowledged that without the support and funds from the grant, none of these initiatives would have been possible.

Despite the success the team has had in working toward its goals, interviewees identified several barriers. These include the following:

- Lack of formal authority to mandate participation.
- Limited participation from small schools.
- Lack of interest or involvement of four-year institutions.
- Issues of local control and individual responsibility.
- Lack of collaboration with other TQE teams.
- Bureaucracy.
- Unawareness of the team's activities.

- Lack of time.

- Difficulty building consensus.

Interviewees mentioned that a major obstacle for this team is the inability to formally mandate that all two- and four-year institutions participate and/or accept the statewide articulation agreement or the use of all three competency tests. The team is acutely aware of each institution's local control and hesitancy to relinquish it. Aside from issues of local control, the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team also is faced with limited participation from small schools and some four-year institutions because of their inability to afford sending a faculty representative to the INTASC meeting or their lack of investment in the initiative. Interviewees also mentioned that there is an insufficient amount of time to delicately manage the duties of one's professional and "grant" life.

Dispositions Assessment Team

Status Update. Since the November 2006 interim report, the Dispositions Assessment Team has divided into two smaller groups: the East Team and the West Team. The travel and logistical difficulties of bringing everyone together from across the state necessitated this division.

The West Team has worked on cultivating the conceptual framework of five large and comprehensive categories of dispositions that could be used to support and modify effective teaching and learning. The West Team identified 23 effective teacher candidate dispositions. Its Five Cs Conceptual Framework comprises five groupings of dispositions, which are labeled Critical, Creative, Communicative, Caring, and Complimentary. Under each of these larger headings are four or five supporting dispositions. For example, for a teacher candidate to demonstrate that she is "Creative," which is described as having "the capacity and inclination to see and do things in novel or apt ways," she must exhibit flexibility, inventiveness, imagination, and resourcefulness. The West Team recently met with its advisory committee to obtain comments and feedback on its conceptual model.

Using the conceptual framework as its base, the East Team selected several dispositions from the larger framework that will be used to develop different assessment instruments. These assessment instruments will be utilized by teachers to document the observed behaviors or artifacts (i.e., reflections) of their student teachers in two to three different settings, such as their introductory classes, field experience, or during their student teaching. The use of both the Five Cs Conceptual Framework and the assessment instruments will be voluntary for schools. Institutions will be able to use these tools as a guide to choose which dispositions are best suited for their students.

Future work for the Dispositions Assessment Team includes incorporating the feedback received from the Advisory Board to refine and finalize the Five Cs Conceptual Framework, continuing to identify the dispositions that will be included in the assessment instruments, developing various assessment tools, piloting the framework and tools in various teacher preparation programs throughout the state, and garnering the support of school districts and AEAs.

Interview Findings for the Dispositions Assessment Team. The evaluation team conducted interviews with three members of the Dispositions Assessment Team. In order to achieve its goal, the Dispositions Assessment Team has actively solicited feedback and advice from various constituencies such as teachers, administrators, and advisory committees. It was important to team members that they did not begin their work with a preconceived notion of what they believed to be the significant dispositions. By asking for feedback, sharing information outside and within the group, and attending various conferences, the team was able to see and make connections between its work and the classroom. As one interviewee noted, "[We are] looking at the deeper dispositions that connect most closely to actually being a terrific teacher."

Despite the success the team has had in working toward its goals, interviewees identified several barriers. These include the following:

- Geography and logistics.

- Lack of collaboration with other TQE teams.

- Bureaucracy.

- Unawareness of the team's activities.

- Lack of time.

- Difficulty building consensus.

- Division of labor and responsibility.

The Dispositions Assessment Team identified several obstacles. As noted earlier, the team has divided itself into two smaller groups because of the geographic and logistical difficulty of getting everyone together. Although the teams recently came together as a whole using the Iowa Communications Network (ICN), interviewees note that this is not as efficient as face-to-face meetings. Similarly, the team often finds it difficult to keep everyone informed of the latest work. Furthermore, even with the feedback team members have received, the team initially found it difficult to come to consensus on the types of dispositions that should be included in the conceptual framework as well as the language that should used to describe and assess them. With regard to bureaucracy, this entails the "red tape" and slow process of getting items approved or receiving reimbursements from the state department of education.

Discussion of Research Question 3

As a group, the Assessment Team, Cross-Institutional Articulation Team, and Dispositions Assessment Team are making sizeable progress toward answering the question, "What has Iowa done to reform teacher education programs to make them more effective through rigorous analysis of candidates and program performance data?" The Assessment Team created and disseminated two RFPs and monitors the implementation of dozens of data management and collection systems across several two- and four-year institutions in Iowa. Similarly, the Dispositions Assessment Team is in its final stages of completing the conceptual framework of the top 23 dispositions a teacher candidate should possess in order to be an effective teacher. This framework, along with the team's developmental assessment tools, will be shared and piloted within the Iowa education community and possibly serve as a model that can be used for other states. Finally, the Cross-

Institutional Articulation Team is still in the early stages of meeting an ambitious goal by bringing two- and four-year institutions together to discuss courses, standards, and mechanisms related to implementing and sustaining a statewide articulation agreement.

These accomplishments have been made despite an assortment of challenges that have presented themselves along the way. One method for contending with and prevailing over the obstacles includes ensuring that the various stakeholders are aware, informed, and clear as to their roles, responsibilities, and the context in which they are being asked to perform.

Federal Indicators

Work pertaining to Goal 3 (reform and improve teacher education programs through rigorous analysis of candidate and program performance data) aligns with one federal program goal as follows:

- **Raising Standards.** "Candidate's progress increasingly meets standards and goals of teacher education programs" (Title II, Section 206 [a][2], Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant). "Increased consistency of course content among teacher education programs resulting in a streamlined transfer process for teacher education students from 2-year to 4-year, and 4-year to 4-year institutions" (Title II, Section 206 [a][2], Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant).

Relative success at meeting this federal program goal is measured by target and performance data. Target and performance data to measure the success of this program goal are not available at this point in the TQE grant.

Research Question 4: Through Collaboration, to What Extent Is Iowa Meeting Future Challenges to Help New Teachers Meet the Educational Demands for the 21st Century?

Work toward this evaluation question is primarily being addressed by the Collaborative Plus Team. This section includes a status update for the team and results from data-collection efforts focused on this team.

Collaborative Plus Team

Status Update. Since the November 2006 interim report, the Collaborative Plus team sent a group of team members to the TQE Forum in New Mexico and was able to develop action plans and a detailed budget to guide their work. Since that time, the team has been planning for two meetings as well as further specifying ideas for professional development opportunities that ultimately will be offered by the group. In June, the Collaborative Plus Team plans to come together with other experts in the field and create a list of competencies that teachers need in order to successfully teach at-risk, gifted and talented, special education, and English-language-learner students. In the fall, the team is planning a kick-off meeting in collaboration with IACTE, where presenters will be sharing experiences related to collaborative teaching. The team also plans to host a summit in fall 2008 that will target principals, teachers, and IHE and AEA personnel.

Interview Findings for the Collaborative Plus Team. The evaluation team interviewed six members of the Collaborative Plus Team. When asked about whether the team is meeting its objectives, most interviewees mentioned that while the team certainly has not met its objectives as of yet, they feel as though it is now on the path to doing so. One interviewee stated that this is the first time anyone has looked at the system as a whole and looked at how K–12 and higher education interface. Many decisions remain, however, about what the team's final artifacts will be and how the professional learning opportunities will ultimately look. In addition, when discussing the competencies for the four groups, one interviewee said, "The questions for us will be—as we identify what those [competencies] are—how and in what ways will we work to help those people infuse the knowledge, skills, and dispositions into their methods classes?" Several interviewees mentioned that one of the major challenges to doing their work was the variability in work styles and perspectives as well as the difficulty balancing grant work with full-time work. While the variability in work styles was mentioned as a challenge, it also was characterized as a facilitator as team members are now able to draw on one another's strengths. Interviewees also mentioned leadership, including the grant director as a facilitator to their work. Several goals for the upcoming year were shared by the interviewees, including working more with AEAs as they are the primary means for professional development in Iowa, connecting with the Dispositions Assessment Team, and convening the competency writing teams in June.

Discussion of Research Question 4

A variety of factors caused the Collaborative Plus Team to get off to a late start working on activities toward their goal. Most team members, however, feel that the team is now on track to meeting the objectives. The challenge presented by a variety of work styles and experiences among team members seemed to be some of the cause to the group's delayed planning, but most interviewees now see this as a facilitator. Despite the recent strides made in action planning for the team, it appears as though several outcomes and measures of success have yet to be articulated. Most of the interviewees also mentioned that they did not think the Collaborative Plus Team's work would be completed within the life of the grant so it will be important to stay focused on the specific tasks in the action plans.

Federal Indicators

Work pertaining to Goal 4 (meeting future challenges through collaboration) aligns with one particular federal program goals as follows:

- **Student Achievement.** "Graduating teacher education students, having completed the reformed teacher education program will possess improved skills related to teacher content areas, which will in turn translate into a sustained and measurable increase in student learning" (Title II, Section 206 [a][1], Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant).

Relative success at meeting this federal program goal is measured by target and performance data. The Learning Point Associates evaluation team will not collect or analyze student achievement data as part of evaluation efforts. Target and performance data to measure the success of the other program goals are not available at this point in the TQE grant.

Complementary Findings Across Teams

The analysis of interview data not only sheds light on the work of individual teams respective to their goals but also allows for the analysis of common themes that exist across all of the TQE teams. This section discusses those common themes and explores their significance for meeting expectations of the TQE grant in the future.

Connecting to the Overarching Theme of the TQE Grant

Across TQE teams, there appears to be a sense of team members' ability to make connections between their work and the overall theme of the Teacher Quality Enhancement grant. In several instances, interviewees discussed links between their team objectives and how they will ultimately benefit teacher quality in Iowa through improved teacher education. One interviewee stated, "Being able to have this grant has been—I just think it's been so critical to the development and the improvement of teacher prep here."

Stakeholder Involvement

Most TQE team members recognize the importance of support, feedback, and influence from stakeholders. Support from the Iowa Department of Education and/or IACTE, for example, can facilitate the participation and cooperation of stakeholders that are more directly impacted by the work, such as individual universities. One interviewee mentioned, "I think that's a huge plus because there's always, there's always somebody that you can go to. There's always somebody at the DE so that you kind of got your foot in the door." Furthermore, acquiring input and feedback from several relevant stakeholders, while often challenging, can improve the probability that final team decisions are representative of many perspectives, thereby increasing chances of success.

Strength of Team Leadership and Team Members

Interviewees commonly mentioned the strength of team leadership as a facilitator. Teams benefited from leaders who were capable of organizing the work of the team and facilitating constructive conversation on relevant topics. One interviewee stated, "It does take a person with special skills to be able to accomplish the goals and objectives, and [the team leader] facilitated the process very well." Another interviewee noted, "We were lucky that we had people who know the process, that once we said we wanted to do this … They know that system so well, that they allowed us to be pretty efficient."

Collaboration

A barrier often cited by interviewees is the lack of collaboration across all of the TQE groups. Some team members mentioned that they are unaware of the work that other teams are doing. Several team members noted that they are so focused on doing the work of their own team that they spend little to no time thinking of opportunities to leverage their work with other teams.

Communication

It looks as if the lack of consistent communication between universities and school districts has impacted the work of several teams. Specifically, teams have found few, if any, consistent contacts who represent that communication conduit. Furthermore, many interviewees stressed the importance of communication, particularly with direct stakeholders, for the success of their team's work. Stakeholders not only need to be notified of each team's work, but they also need to be brought on board to help disseminate information, garner feedback, and generally help to establish buy-in for the team's efforts. Teams found that communication needs to be timely, precise, and personalized.

Bureaucratic Processes

The variation in bureaucratic processes across the different entities—schools, universities, and the Iowa Department of Education—was mentioned as a challenge for many of the interviewees. Interviewees discuss some of the difficulties in dealing with the bureaucratic processes in these agencies as follows:

- Bureaucracy in university systems:
  - "…how hard it is to get something done at a university."
  - "It's been a surprise to me how hard it is for schools to get into that world, when in fact, you know, we know exactly what they're going to need once they hit us."
  - "The wheels of a university move very slow. You have to propose it. You have to go to a faculty counsel. You have to then be approved. Then the program has to be okayed. … I've been amazed how long it's taken."
- Bureaucracy in Iowa Department of Education system:
  - "Schools need more flexibility from DE in amending the budget."
  - "It just takes a long time to work through all of the basically red tape that it takes to get to spend money. … It's just that it takes a really long time to get permission to do things—to get permission even to spend the money that you've been awarded in a particular way."

Time

By far, the most commonly cited barrier to doing TQE work is team members' time. Interviewees noted that it is often difficult for teams to find enough common time to get all team members involved in the work and for team members to properly balance their personal time commitments with the needs and demands of the work of the team. This also is true of stakeholder time as interviewees shared difficulties with convening stakeholders outside of their daily jobs in order to discuss grant work. Others mentioned that time may impact the team's ability to complete team objectives during the grant timeline. Interviewees discussed how the lack of time has impacted their work on the grant as follows:

- "I think the challenges exist with scheduling and time, to be able to coordinate to get people together, and just the time that it takes with the communication."

- "There's no way we're going to get the end goal all met by the time the grant ends. We're hoping that it has long-term effects."

- "[It is] hard to get everyone together at the same time and for a long enough period of time to accomplish work."

Building Consensus

Many interviewees discussed the challenges their teams face in building consensus both within their teams and occasionally among direct stakeholders. Several interviewees noted that collaborating and developing consensus within their own team was particularly challenging during the first year of work as teams conceptualized their scopes of work, definitions, and a common language. Interviewees noted the importance of cultivating a common vision despite multiple perspectives. For example, one interviewee stated, "It was like we had to model collaboration, and we had to learn it as we went, and realize our varying roles, and our gifts and our strengths, as well as the things that need balance."

The commonalities that exist among grant teams can be used to assist teams in their work going forward, particularly how teams can cause their work to make a larger contribution to the TQE grant overall.

Document Review Analysis

Following are findings from the document review conducted on 10 key documents generated and submitted by the following TQE teams: the Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team, Middle-Level Content Team, and Assessment Team. Details for the document review process are included in the Evaluation Methods section.

Communication

Documents were assessed upon five indicators or criteria related specifically to communication. It should be noted that some components of this section did not apply to all the reviewed documents. In such cases, those documents that received an N/A were included in the rating given for that specific criterion.

Indicator: The expressed purpose of the document reflects Iowa TQE grant goals. These are: strengthen teaching in the content areas, improve teaching for diverse populations, reform improvement through analysis, and meet future challenges through collaboration.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, the documents clearly reflected the Iowa TQE grant goals. Some of the articulated purposes of the documents included "the development and implementation of a professional development school at a middle school in Iowa" or "collaborate in the use of research-based strategies to enhance teacher effectiveness in reading, math, and science at the middle school level" or "investigating and improving secondary teacher candidates and secondary content area teachers' knowledge and practices in teaching reading in the content areas."

Indicator: Clearly establishes TQE team goals or objectives.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, there is notable evidence in several documents that the TQE team goals or objectives are clearly established. For example, the midterm report submitted by the Des Moines Public Schools to the Middle-Level Content Team states that one of its goals is to help support the objectives of the Middle-Level Content Team by "increasing the use of research-based instructional strategies in middle school reading, math, and science classrooms during the 2006–2007 school year."

Indicator: States clearly and precisely the purpose of the document.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- A document from the Assessment Team states that it is a rubric for community college or four-year assessment system awards, and the purpose of the letter and RFP created by the Reading and Writing Team is to announce its upcoming Question-Answer Relationship (QAR) seminar and to recruit participants.

Indicator: Document content and language is directed toward key stakeholders.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, the language and content of the various documents were directed at several key stakeholders such as teacher education chairs and faculty members; principals, superintendents, and teachers; and members of the various TQE teams.

Indicator: Clear deadlines are articulated.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, deadlines for submission of proposals and the implementation of various professional development activities were clearly articulated in the majority of the documents.

Establishing Partnerships

Documents were assessed upon three indicators or criteria related specifically to establishing or supporting partnerships. It should be noted that some components of this section did not apply to all the reviewed documents. In such cases, those documents that received an N/A were excluded from the rating given for that specific criterion.

Indicator: Specifically identifies IHEs, administrators, or other key stakeholders as support mechanisms in achieving team goals or objectives.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, several documents identified important stakeholders to become support mechanisms or partners in achieving team goals. These stakeholders include the Iowa Department of Education, Iowa Board of Educational Examiners, Iowa Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, National Middle School Association, Heartland Area Education Agency, public school districts and school principals, and several four-year institutions.

Indicator: States clearly and precisely the intent, goals, or expectations for the partnership.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, some documents such as the Reading and Writing in the Content Area Team letter and RFP state specifically that participants (which may be partnerships) are encouraged to attend one of two Summer Professional Seminars that will be hosted in June and that they will be required to participate in three follow-up sessions to be held throughout the year.

Indicator: States clearly and precisely if there are any consequences for breaking the contract, agreement, or partnership.
Rating: No Coverage

- Under this criterion, none of the documents discussed consequences for not following through with partnership expectations.

Practical and/or Feasible Implementation

Documents were assessed upon six indicators or criteria related to practical and/or feasible implementation. It should be noted that some components of this section did not apply to all the reviewed documents. In such cases, those documents that received an N/A were excluded from the rating given for that specific criterion.

Indicator: Document provides detailed policy background or context.
Rating: Minimal Coverage

- Under this criterion, only a minimal amount of policy background or context was provided within some of the documents. For example, two documents give a brief overview of the QAR technique. Other documents, however, do not articulate a clear policy background or context for the document.

Indicator: Gives detailed description of initiatives/activities.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, the descriptions of the initiatives and activities often were found throughout the documents. One document, the midterm report submitted by Gilbert Middle School, provided the reader with a detailed table of the initiatives it hoped to achieve.

Indicator: Sets clear guidelines as to how and when details of the document will be implemented.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, plans are included in some documents, such as the Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team letters and RFPs, which state that the team plans to hire and work with Nancy Wilson, assistant professor in the Department of Teaching and Learning Principals at the University of Central Florida, as the QAR seminar leader.

- Other documents provided time-frame details, such as the Gilbert Middle School midterm report, which states that the school hopes to begin the reinstatement of its middle school endorsement program in spring 2007.

Indicator: Establishes guidelines for how to use or implement suggested policies, practices, initiatives, or activities.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, some documents—such as the Reading and Writing Team RFPs and the midterm reports from Luther College, Decorah Middle School, and Des Moines Public Schools—described their guidelines for how to use or implement their suggested policies, practices, initiatives, or activities. For example, all individuals or teams who submit a proposal in response to the RFP must sign a statement of assurances stating that they will attend the QAR summer session as well as the three follow-up sessions, consent to implementing the QAR at their school as it was designed, and agree to meet at least once a month and provide logs detailing the dates of attendance, individuals present, and topics discussed.

Indicator: There is a focus on sound educational research and practice.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, several documents discuss the various ways in which they are utilizing or engaging in sound educational research and practice. This is particularly evident in the Middle-Level Content Team midterm reports. For instance, several of the awardees attended the National Middle School Conference last November to participate in discussions with nationally known speakers about the middle school best practices.

Indicator: Has clearly defined plan to utilize respondent feedback results, such as guidelines for reviewing or evaluating work.
Rating: Minimal Coverage

- Under this criterion, the majority of the documents did not articulate clear plans for how results or feedback would be utilized.

Strengthening Teaching in the Content Areas

Documents were assessed upon two indicators or criteria related specifically to strengthening teaching in the content areas. It should be noted that some components of this section did not apply to all the reviewed documents. In such cases, those documents that received an N/A were excluded from the rating given for that specific criterion.

Indicator: Clearly defined strategies for building both content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge in mathematics, reading, writing, and science.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, some of the documents had clear and wide-ranging strategies for building both content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge in mathematics, reading, writing, and science. Some strategies that were recommended included learning how to use and implement the QAR strategy; allowing for preservice teachers to participate in

college-level courses on standards-based mathematics and attendance at the National Middle School Association National Conference.

Indicator: Focus on curriculum alignment with national/state/district standards or performance indicators.
Rating: Minimal Coverage

- Under this criterion, there is minimal discussion within the documents regarding alignment with the national, state, or district standards.

Reform Teacher Education Programs Through Analysis of Candidates and Program Performance Data

Documents were assessed upon four indicators or criteria related specifically to reforming teacher education programs through analysis of candidates and program performance data. It should be noted that some components of this section did not apply to all the reviewed documents. In such cases, those documents that received an N/A were excluded from the rating given for that specific criterion.

Indicator: Clearly identifies which competencies, practices, courses, policies, or procedures need to be taught, assessed, or monitored.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Examples of some of the courses, competencies, and practices that need to be taught, assessed, or monitored include middle school math statistics, educational psychology, professional development training on effective teaming, coteaching, differentiated instruction, and collaboration among four-year institutions.

Indicator: States specific minimum and/or maximum cut-off or acceptance criteria (e.g., cut-off scores, grade-point average, course credits).
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- The Assessment Team revised RFP scoring rubric, for instance, gives a three-point rating scale.

Indicator: Establishes guidelines for reporting data on teacher candidates.
Rating: No Coverage

- Under this criterion, documents did not cover how teams would be collecting data on teacher candidates as a part of their work.

Indicator: Establishes clear strategies to help in the development of teacher educators.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, there was extensive coverage of strategies that will be used to help in the development of teacher educators. These strategies include the two summer QAR

sessions, professional development training on differentiated instruction, effective learning, and the availability of free or reduced-cost college-level courses.

Raises Standards and/or Accountability for Institutions of Higher Education, Administrators, Students, or Teachers

Documents were assessed upon one indicator or criterion related specifically to raising standards or accountability for IHEs, administrators, students, or teachers. It should be noted that some components of this section did not apply to all the reviewed documents. In such cases, those documents that received an N/A were excluded from the rating given for that specific criterion.

Indicator: Requires clearly defined formative or summative strategies for tracking the effectiveness of work.
Rating: Minimal Coverage

- Under this criterion, there was great variability in terms of the formative or summative methods instituted to track the effectiveness of the work. The majority of the documents failed to mention a strategy, while only one document described daily sign-in sheets, team meeting minutes, and participant evaluations.

Professional Development

Documents were assessed upon three indicators or criteria related specifically to establishing or supporting professional development initiatives for student teachers. It should be noted that some components of this section did not apply to all the reviewed documents. In such cases, those documents that received an N/A were excluded from the rating given for that specific criterion.

Indicator: Components of professional development are clearly aligned with state and national standards.
Rating: Minimal Coverage

- Under this criterion, documents only minimally described whether the various professional development activities they are offering to teacher candidates are aligned with state or national standards.

Indicator: Learning activities are clearly described and are relevant and rigorous.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, some of the documents such as the Reading and Writing Team's letters and RFPs as well as the midterm report submitted on behalf of Gilbert Middle School cite examples of relevant and rigorous learning activities. For example, the Reading and Writing Team describes the QAR strategy as a tool that will teach students to "develop metacognitive awareness … [The] QAR gives teachers a framework for organizing comprehension strategy instruction across all grade levels from elementary through high school, and in a variety of content areas."

Indicator: Establishes guidelines or strategies for ensuring that professional development translates into effective classroom strategies.
Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, several documents such as the Middle-Level Content Team midterm reports and the Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team letters and RFP establish clear strategies for ensuring that professional development translates into effective classroom strategies. For example, the midterm report completed by Gilbert Middle School requires that after teachers engage in coteaching and differentiated instruction, they must document what they learned and experienced in an implementation log.

Assessment

Documents were assessed upon three indicators or criteria related specifically to assessing and tracking the effectiveness of the various initiatives or programs. It should be noted that some components of this section did not apply to all the reviewed documents. In such cases, those documents that received an N/A were excluded from the rating given for that specific criterion.

Indicator: Clearly defined strategies to evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of teacher education programs.
Rating: Not Applicable

- Review of the documents reveals this specific criterion cannot be assessed. None of the documents reviewed had planned to evaluate or monitor a teacher education program.

Indicator: Utilizes various tools (i.e., assessments, rubrics) to monitor the success of policies, programs, or initiatives.
Rating: No Coverage

- Under this criterion, none of the documents utilized more than one main method for monitoring the success of their policies, programs, or initiatives.

Indicator: Use of multiple assessments for diagnostic and reteaching purpose.
Rating: Minimal Coverage

- Under this criterion, only two documents showed evidence of the use of multiple assessments for diagnostic and reteaching purposes. For example, Gilbert Middle School plans to use the mathematics and reading inventory that was administered to students in Grades 5–8 as a way to evaluate its impact on these students' mathematics and reading achievement. The school also plans to use the results from the Iowa Test of Basic Skills for a summative evaluation of the students' mathematics and reading achievement.

Conclusion and Recommendations

During the past year and a half, six individual teams have put forth tremendous effort and made real strides in moving forward the work of the Iowa Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant. From the perspective of those most closely involved with the work, this report details those efforts as well as the many barriers and facilitators the teams encountered along the way. Furthermore, team members and stakeholders shared with the evaluation team their views on the teams' greatest accomplishments of the year as well as goals for continued work. Several recommendations stand out for the continued success of all teams as they work to improve teacher education in Iowa as follows:

- It is important for each team to make a concerted effort toward promoting and facilitating collaborative conversations with other TQE teams when appropriate. Despite the fact that there are more than 30 teacher preparation institutions in Iowa, several individuals and groups are participating in work for more than one team and available stakeholders will soon become limited. Teams might thoughtfully consider and implement strategies for leveraging one another's work and communicating on behalf of the Iowa Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant as a whole.

- Teams should consider developing more explicit short-term and long-term goals and performance measures for their work. Relative success of the initiatives will be much easier to aim for and describe once these have been established.

- Sustainability of this work after the grant ends is paramount to the ongoing improvement of teacher education programs in Iowa. The time is nigh for teams to craft sustainable development plans to allow their efforts to continue to grow long after the grant funds end. This action planning might include communication plans, responsible person(s) or groups, timelines (including short-term and long-term goals), and necessary resources.

- In order to facilitate team meetings as well as convenings for stakeholders, teams should continue thinking about ways to engage and leverage technology in their work. The TQE grant has a technology coordinator who can assist with this planning. Furthermore, details about the TQE grant can be found on the Iowa Department of Education website (www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_staticxt&staticfile=default.htm&Itemid =1041).

Next Steps

Based on the extensive work of the TQE teams this year as well as much of their proposed work for next year, the Learning Point Associates evaluation team will pursue a variety of next steps for the November 2007 interim report as well as for next year's final report. These include further document reviews (e.g., the Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team proposals for summer institutes and the proposed Middle-Level Content Team endorsements), interviews (e.g., attendees of the tentative Middle-Level Teacher's Academy), and surveys (e.g., new teachers and IHE faculty regarding the competencies developed by the Collaborative Plus Team). The role and purpose of the evaluation is to provide formative and summative feedback to TQE grant participants, and the evaluation team at Learning Point Associates is constantly looking for ways to make evaluation reports more user-friendly. In the coming months of the grant, the evaluation team will be looking to TQE grant participants to provide suggestions as to whether more or different information would be useful to teams as they work to meet their goals. Furthermore, at the upcoming meeting in June where all TQE teams will be present, the evaluation team will have the opportunity to interact with and observe TQE team members.

Appendix A. Interview Protocols

Interview Protocol for the Assessment Team

1. Please describe your current position within the Assessment Team. How long have you been in your role?

2. How is the Assessment Team meeting its objectives of:

   a. (1) Developing evaluation tools for PK–12 cooperating teachers so that they have the ability to provide feedback on student teacher performance?

   b. (2) Developing assessments of first- and second-year teachers with cooperation of principals and Department of Education training staff?

   c. (3) Developing the capacity of teacher education programs to gather, manage, and analyze performance data to improve teacher education?

   How do you know this? Provide specific examples.

3. Have there been any challenges to your work since you started on the IA TQE grant? If so, provide examples.

4. Are there examples of factors that have facilitated your work since you started on the IA TQE grant?

5. In your opinion, what are the team's greatest accomplishments made in 2006?

6. What did you learn from last year's awardees?

7. Please describe any changes the Assessment Team has made with regards to monitoring and assessing the second round of RFPs.

   a. Probes:

      i. Guidelines

      ii. Rubrics

      iii. Entrance criteria

8. In your opinion, do you believe the IHEs are providing adequate support of the Assessment Team's initiatives? If yes, how? Provide examples. If no, why not?

9. Do you plan to conduct follow-up with the preparing institutions that are participating in the institution-by-institution database to assess the extent to which they are utilizing the data being collected and/or whether (or not) they deem the database and partnership useful?

10. With regards to the institution-by-institution database that the Assessment Team helped establish between the preparing institutions and the Iowa Department of Education, does the

team have a method (i.e., tracking system) that will allow you to track and/or monitor whether the Department of Education is providing names and addresses in a timely fashion to the preparing institutions?

11. Can you describe the Assessment Team's role in the piloting of the IDESTE tool that is slated to occur later on this year? Are members of the Assessment Team going to provide the training, or will they be overseeing the work?

12. For this upcoming 2007 year, please identify at least one or two goals the Assessment Team hopes to accomplish.

13. Has the Assessment Team collaborated with any of the other TQE teams on any of the TQE Grant goals? If yes, please specify with whom and what the outcome was.

14. Is there anything else that you can tell us that will help us understand in more depth the changes and improvements made to the Assessment Team and its ability achieve its team and larger IA TQE grant goals?

Interview Protocol for the Assessment Team Grantees—First Round

1. Please tell me your current title and position. How long have you been in your role?

2. Is your institution a community college, regent university, or four-year institution?

3. What has been your role in terms of implementing the performance assessment systems at your institution?

4. Is your institution collaborating with an outside institution or another department within your school as part of this work? If yes, with whom and what is their role?

5. Can you describe the type of performance assessment system that your school is trying to implement or improve? Who is its intended audience, and how do you expect this new assessment system will help them?

6. How have the grant funds affected the implementation of your electronic data collection and management systems?

7. Is your electronic data collection and management system completely implemented and working? If yes, how are you measuring this success? If no, why not?

8. Please explain any challenges or setbacks you have encountered since you were awarded these funds.

9. Are there examples of factors that have facilitated your work since you started working on this initiative?

10. In your opinion, what were the greatest accomplishments made in 2006 in terms of this work?

11. Did your institution complete and submit an interim report to the Assessment Team? What about a final report to the Assessment Team?

12. Did your institution resubmit a proposal for this second round of RFPs with the hopes of receiving additional funds to continue your work? If yes, how do you plan to use these additional funds? If no, why did you choose not to reapply?

13. In your opinion, do you believe the Assessment Team is providing adequate support of your initiative? If yes, how? Provide examples. If no, why not?

14. For this upcoming 2007 year and keeping in mind this work, please identify at least one or two goals your institution hopes to accomplish.

15. Is there anything else that you can tell us that will help us understand in more depth the changes and improvements made to implement or sustain your data collection and management system?

Interview Protocol for the Collaborative Plus Team

1. Please describe your current position with the Collaborative Plus Team. How long have you been in your role?

2. Can you explain why the team decided to change its name from the Collaboration, Differentiation, and Dispositions (CD2) team back to the Collaborative Plus Team?

3. Do you think the Collaborative Plus Team is meeting its objective of providing every beginning teacher in Iowa with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions so that they can effectively collaborate with others and address the specific needs of students with disabilities, gifted and talented students, English language learners, and those students considered at risk? Please provide examples.

4. Have there been any challenges to the Collaborative Plus Team's work? If so, provide examples.

5. Are there examples of factors that have facilitated the Collaborative Plus Team's work?

6. In your opinion, what are the greatest accomplishments made in 2006?

7. Please describe plans for the biannual summit. How will the Collaborative Plus Team garner participation? What can participants hope to take away from the summit?

8. Please describe the steps the Collaborative Plus Team has taken to achieve its goals related to:

   a. Developing professional learning opportunities and events for teacher preparation faculty.

   b. Conducting research on meeting the needs of diverse learners.

   c. Recommending changes for the Chapter 79 Administrative rules.

9. Does the Collaborative Plus Team plan to conduct any needs-sensing or follow-up interviews or assistance with the other TQE teams and teacher educators who work with ELL, special education, at-risk, and gifted students to determine their needs?

10. For this upcoming 2007 year, please identify at least one or two goals or activities the Collaborative Plus Team hopes to accomplish.

11. In your opinion, do you believe the other IA TQE teams are providing adequate support of the Collaborative Plus Team initiatives? If yes, how? Provide examples. If no, why not? Provide examples.

12. Has the Collaborative Plus Team collaborated with any of the other TQE teams?

13. Is there anything else that you can tell us that will help us understand in more depth the changes and improvements made to the Collaborative Plus Team and its ability achieve its team and larger IA TQE grant goals?

Interview Protocol for the Cross-Articulation Team

1. Please describe your current position within the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team. How long have you been in your role?

2. Do you think the Cross-Articulation Team is meeting its objectives of :

   a. (1) Improving preservice teacher candidates' preparation statewide?

   b. (2) Creating a statewide articulation agreement among two- and four-year colleges of teacher preparation?

   c. (3) Creating a statewide agreement on basic competency testing to enter teacher education programs?

   d. (4) Strengthening the mathematics and oral/written communication skills of preservice candidates?

   e. (5) Researching successful articulation factors and barriers for students transferring from two-year to four year and four-year to four-year colleges into education programs?

   If yes, provide examples. If not, why?

3. Have there been any challenges to your work since you started on the Iowa TQE grant? If so, provide examples.

4. Are there examples of factors that have facilitated your work since you started on the Iowa TQE grant?

5. In your opinion, what are the greatest accomplishments made in 2006?

6. Do you know if there were any community colleges and four-year institutions already working together on an articulation agreement prior to the work of the Cross-Articulation Team? If yes, can you give an estimate or percentage of those partnerships?

7. In your opinion, do you think the INTASC Alignment Meetings are achieving the goal of bringing two-year and four-year institutions together to work on articulation issues and building consensus on what needs to be taught and assessed for potential teacher candidates?

8. Please describe the current status of the Articulation Agreement.

   Probes (provide examples):

   i. Are there any changes the Cross-Articulation Team has made with regards to development?

   ii. Garnering support?

   iii. Disseminating the articulation agreement?

9. As of November 2006, there were 15 schools that have agreed to work together on creating an articulation agreement. As of March 2007, has that number changed?

10. In your opinion, do you think the articulation agreement will be implemented at the two- and four-year institutions? Why or why not?

    Probe:
    Use of all three competency tests (i.e., PPST, C-BASE, and CAAP)?

11. In your opinion, do you believe the two- and four-year institutions are providing adequate support of the Cross-Articulation Team initiatives? If yes, how? If no, why not? Provide examples.

12. Do you plan to conduct any follow-up with the IHEs that have agreed to utilize the competency tests and articulation agreement to determine the extent of implementation?

13. What strategies (if any) have you or will you employ to engage the Arts and Science faculty participation? How specifically will you measure the success of this goal?

14. Has the Cross-Articulation Team conducted surveys and focus-group discussions among IHEs and transfer students on the barriers they are facing? Who participated in the survey, how were they selected, and what were the significant findings? What will you do with these results?

15. Does the Cross-Articulation Team currently have a timeline in place for the 2007 year? If yes, please describe any major goals/objectives and dates you hope to achieve them.

16. Has the Cross-Articulation Team collaborated with any of the other TQE teams on any of the TQE Grant goals? If yes, please specify with whom and what the outcome was.

17. Is there anything else that you can tell us that will help us understand in more depth the changes and improvements made to the Cross-Articulation Team and its ability to achieve its team and larger Iowa TQE grant goals?

Interview Protocol for the Cross-Articulation Team Survey Responders

1. In general, how useful are the ongoing meetings and discussions in terms of providing participants the opportunity to discuss cross articulation issues between two- and four-year institutions? Please cite examples as to how the meetings are or are not useful in facilitating these discussions.

2. What would it take from either the local and/or state level for your institution to sign on and implement a statewide articulation agreement? (Probe for changes in course requirements, GPA, dispositions.)

3. What are the biggest challenges to developing and implementing a statewide cross-articulation agreement in Iowa?

4. In your opinion, how important is a statewide cross-articulation agreement in terms of improving the quality of *teacher candidates* in Iowa?

5. In your opinion, how important is a statewide cross-articulation agreement in terms of improving the quality of *teacher preparation programs* in Iowa?

Interview Protocol for the Dispositions Team

1. Please describe your current position within the Dispositions Team. How long have you been in your role?

2. How is the Dispositions Team meeting its objective of initiating effective techniques for assessing ethical and professional behaviors of teacher candidates? Provide specific examples.

3. Have there been any challenges to your work since you started on the Iowa TQE grant? If so, provide examples.

   Probe about the Conceptual Framework and the Developmental Assessment Template.

4. Are there examples of factors that have facilitated your work since you started on the IA TQE grant?

   Probe about the Conceptual Framework and the Developmental Assessment Template.

5. Can you describe the template? Which dispositions are included and why were these dispositions chosen? Were there specific dispositions that were considered and not included?

6. Do the East and West groups come together to discuss and inform one another of the activities and progress of their respective groups? If so, how?

7. In your opinion, what were the team's greatest accomplishments in 2006?

8. In your opinion, do you think the template of dispositions will be well received in school districts? AEAs? IHEs? Why or why not?

9. To what extent do you think the template will (or will not) be implemented within school districts? AEAs? IHEs? If no, what do you think will hinder its implementation?

10. In your opinion, do you believe the AEAs, IHEs, and school districts are providing adequate support of the Dispositions Team's initiatives? If yes, how? Provide examples. If no, why not? Provide examples.

11. With regards to AEA, IHE, and school district participation, do you currently have or do you plan to have a method (i.e., tracking system) that will allow you to track and/or monitor their use and implementation of your recommended dispositions?

12. What strategies (if any) will you employ to garner AEA, IHE, and school district participation in using the template?

13. For this upcoming 2007 year, please identify at least one or two goals or activities the Dispositions Team hopes to accomplish.

14. Has the Dispositions Team collaborated with any of the other TQE teams on TQE Grant goals? If yes, please specify with whom and what the outcome was.

15. Is there anything else that you can tell us that will help us understand in more depth the changes and improvements made to the Dispositions Team and its ability to develop and disseminate the template of core dispositions?

Interview Protocol for the Grant Director

1. In your opinion, to what extent is the Cross-Articulation Team meeting its goals? What could they do differently or better?

2. In your opinion, to what extent is the Dispositions Team meeting its goals? What could they do differently or better?

3. In your opinion, to what extent is the Reading and Writing Team meeting its goals? What could they do differently or better?

4. In your opinion, to what extent is the Assessment Team meeting its goals? What could they do differently or better?

5. In your opinion, to what extent is the Collaborations Team meeting its goals? What could they do differently or better?

6. In your opinion, to what extent is the Middle Level Team meeting its goals? What could they do differently or better?

7. What are the greatest challenges associated with grant implementation?

8. What, overall, is working well?

Interview Protocol for the Middle-Level Content Team

1. Please describe your current position within the Middle-Level Content Areas Team. How long have you been in your role?

2. Do you think the Middle-Level Team is meeting its objective of strengthening teaching in the content areas so that the skills of new secondary and middle school teachers will be reformed and strengthened? Please provide examples.

3. Have there been any challenges to your work since you started on the Iowa TQE grant? If so, provide examples.

4. Are there examples of factors that have facilitated your work since you started on the Iowa TQE grant?

5. In your opinion, what are the greatest accomplishments made in 2006?

6. Please describe some of the main findings of the surveys and focus-group studies with teachers and administrators to assess the best practices for teaching middle schools. How are the results being utilized?

7. Describe the extent to which you think the middle school models will or will not be implemented in school districts and teacher education classrooms.

8. What strategies (if any) will you employ to garner IHE and school district participation in using the middle school models? How, if at all, do you plan to monitor and/or follow up on this participation?

9. Please describe the status of the new middle school endorsements. How did the endorsements get to that point?

10. Describe your expectations for the new endorsements.

11. In your opinion, do you believe the IHEs and school districts are providing adequate support of the Middle-Level Team initiatives? If yes, how? Provide examples. If no, why not? Provide examples.

12. For this upcoming 2007 year, please identify at least one or two goals or activities the Middle-Level Team hopes to accomplish.

13. Has the Middle-Level Team collaborated with any of the other TQE teams on any of the TQE Grant goals? If yes, please specify with whom and what the outcome was.

14. Is there anything else that you can tell us that will help us understand in more depth the changes and improvements made to the Middle-Level Team and its ability to achieve its team and the larger Iowa TQE grant goals?

Interview Protocol for the Middle-Level Team Grant Awardees

1. Please tell me your current title and position. How long have you been in your role?

2. Is your institution or organization collaborating with a public school district, area education agency, professional organization, or a higher education institution (i.e., community college or four-year) as part of this work? If yes, with whom and what is their role?

3. What has been your role in terms of implementing this program or activities?

4. Can you describe your model or the research-based strategies that you are trying to implement? What are the goals or objectives of your program and how specifically will you measure its success (i.e., what types of student achievement data are they collecting)?

5. How has your program or activities changed or improved the following:

   a. Professional development for preservice and inservice teachers

   b. Helping preservice and inservice teachers learn effective ways to teach reading, math, and science in the middle school

6. In your opinion, would you say that your organization or institution is achieving its objectives set forth in your proposal? How do you know this? Please provide examples.

7. How have the grant funds affected the implementation and/or sustainability of this program?

8. Please explain any challenges or setbacks you have encountered since you were awarded these funds.

9. Are there examples of factors that have facilitated your work since you started working on this initiative?

10. In your opinion, what were the greatest accomplishments made in 2006 in terms of this work?

11. Describe the extent to which you think *your* middle school models will or will not be implemented in school districts and teacher education classrooms.

12. In your opinion, do you believe the Middle-Level Team is providing adequate support of your initiative? If yes, how? Provide examples. If no, why not?

13. For this upcoming 2007 year and keeping in mind this work, please identify at least one or two goals your institution hopes to accomplish.

14. Is there anything else that you can tell us that will help us understand in more depth the changes and improvements made to implement or sustain your data collection and management system?

Interview Protocol for the Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team and Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team Match-Up

1. Please describe your current position with the Reading and Writing Team. How long have you been in your role?

2. Describe how the Reading and Writing Team is meeting its objective of developing models and building the capacity of content-area teacher educators, teacher candidates, and teachers to use research-based strategy instruction to improve reading and writing in the content areas. Please provide examples.

3. Have there been any challenges to your work since you started on the Iowa TQE grant? If so, provide examples.

4. Are there examples of factors that have facilitated your work since you started on the Iowa TQE grant?

5. In your opinion, what were last year's greatest accomplishments for the Reading and Writing Team?

6. Please describe QAR and CORI and provide a brief explanation for its use within the Reading and Writing Team.

7. How do you plan to garner participation and establish partnerships between the CORI- and QAR-trained teachers and higher education institutions? How many partnerships do you hope to create? How, if at all, do you plan to monitor and/or follow up with these partnerships?

8. In your opinion, do you believe the higher education institutions, AEAs, and QAR- and CORI-trained school teams are providing adequate support of the Reading and Writing Team's initiatives? If yes, how? Provide examples. If no, why not? Provide examples.

9. To what extent do you think the book of content-related resources will (or will not) be used by school districts, AEAs, and IHEs? Provide examples.

10. Has the Reading and Writing Team collaborated with any of the other TQE teams on TQE Grant goals? If yes, please specify with whom and what the outcome was.

11. For this upcoming 2007 year, please identify at least one or two goals or activities the Reading and Writing Team hopes to accomplish.

12. How did you hear about the opportunity to do a school-university match-up using QAR/CORI through the Iowa TQE grant?

13. Please describe your role in the match-up between Hoover High School and Grandview College.

14. Please describe details about the match-up. Who was involved? How long was it? What did it entail? What were the outcomes of this match-up?

15. Would you recommend this experience for other educators or teacher educators in Iowa? Why or why not?

16. Is there anything else that you can tell us that will help us understand in more depth the changes and improvements made to the Reading and Writing Team and its ability to achieve its team's and the larger IA TQE grant goals?

Appendix B. Survey Protocol

1. **Please identify the type of institution with which you are affiliated.** *(Participant to check appropriate box.)*
   a. Community College
   b. Regents University
   c. Four-Year Institution

2. **Select your school from the drop-down list.** *(Melissa to create drop-down list of all IHEs in the state of Iowa.)*

3. **What is your job title?** *(Open-ended)*

4. **What is your area of focus or specialty?** *(Open-ended)*

5. **Are you a member of the arts and sciences faculty at your institution?** *(Participant to check appropriate box.)*
   a. Yes
   b. No

6. **How did you hear about the Cross-Articulation Team, its work, and the February 19, 2007, INTASC Alignment Meeting? (Select all that apply.)** *(Participant to check appropriate boxes.)*
   a. E-mail
   b. Phone
   c. Word-of-mouth
   d. Flyer or newsletter
   e. I attended a previous workshop or meeting hosted by the Cross-Articulation Team
   f. Other, please specify

7. **Did you participate in the first INTASC Alignment Meeting hosted by the Cross-Articulation Team on September 18, 2006?** *(Participant to check appropriate box.)*
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Don't remember

8. **Do you plan to participate in the upcoming June 2007 INTASC Alignment Meeting?** *(Participant to check appropriate box.)*
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Maybe

9. **How effective was the February 19, 2007, INTASC Alignment Meeting in terms of providing you with an opportunity to meet, discuss, and collaborate with members of other teacher preparation programs Iowa?**
    a. Very Effective
    b. Somewhat Effective
    c. Somewhat Ineffective
    d. Very Ineffective
    e. Did Not Participate

10. **How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement? "The Cross-Articulation Team is meeting its goal of creating a statewide articulation agreement among two- and four-year colleges of teacher preparation."** *(Participant to choose from 5-point Likert scale.)*
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Somewhat Agree
    c. Somewhat Disagree
    d. Strong Disagree

11. **How successful do you think the Cross-Articulation Team will be in achieving its goal of creating a statewide articulation agreement by spring 2008?**
    a. Very Successful
    b. Somewhat Successful
    c. Somewhat Unsuccessful
    d. Very Unsuccessful

12. **Are you currently working in partnership with another institution of higher education (IHE) to form an articulation agreement?** *(Participant to check appropriate box.)*
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. If no, why not? *(Open-ended response)*

13. **If yes, with how many IHEs is your school currently in partnership?** *(Participants to check appropriate box.)*
    a. None
    b. 1 to 2
    c. 3 to 4
    d. 5 to 6
    e. 7 or more

14. **If you answered yes to Question 12 about having a partnership with another IHE, was this partnership initiated as a result of participating in one of the INTASC alignment meetings?** *(Participant to check the appropriate box.)*
    a. Yes
    b. No, my school *already had* a partnership in place prior to these INTASC alignment meetings.
    c. No, my school has decided *not to participate* at this time.
    d. Not applicable

15. If you currently have a partnership with another IHE, identify how many of these partnering institutions are *community colleges, regent universities,* **or** *four-year institutions***.** *(Participant to fill in appropriate boxes.)*

    a. Community College
    b. Regent University
    c. Four-year institution
    d. Not Applicable

16. If your school currently has a partnership in place with one or more IHE, identify whether consensus has been reached on: (A) the minimum grade-point average (GPA), (B) course requirements, and (C) grade requirements needed for education majors to transfer. (If you have more than one partnership in place, respond to this question with the longest running partnership in mind.) *(Participant to check appropriate box.)*

    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. Still in Negotiation
    d. Not Applicable

17. In your opinion, how helpful has the Cross-Articulation Team been in coordinating and initiating talks between two- and four-year institutions? *(Participant to choose from a 5-point Likert scale.)*

    a. Extremely Helpful
    b. Somewhat Helpful
    c. Somewhat Unhelpful
    d. Extremely Unhelpful

18. Rate how often the education faculty and the arts and sciences faculty at your institution communicate or collaborate with each other.

    a. All of the time
    b. Most of the time
    c. Rarely
    d. Never

Appendix C. Document Review Rubric

Scoring Rubric

—2— **Extensive Coverage** • Information is clearly articulated, apparent, and easily located within the document. • Information provided within the document sufficiently addresses the targeted indicator under this thematic area.
—1— **Minimal Coverage** • Information is not directly apparent within the document. • Information inadequately addresses the targeted indicator under this thematic area.
—0— **No Coverage** • There appears to be no coverage of required information in the document that addresses the targeted indicator under this thematic area.

Communication

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
The expressed purpose of the document reflects Iowa Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant goal(s) These are: • Strengthen teaching in the content areas. • Improve teaching for diverse populations. • Reform improvement through analysis. • Meet future challenges through collaboration.				
Clearly establishes TQE team goals or objectives.				
States clearly and precisely the purpose of the document.				
Document content and language is directed toward key stakeholders.				
Clear deadlines are articulated.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 5) (Range 0–10):				

Establishing Partnerships

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Specifically identifies IHEs, administrators, or other key stakeholders as support mechanisms in achieving team goals or objectives.				
States clearly and precisely the intent, goals, or expectations for the partnership.				
States clearly and precisely if there are any consequences for breaking the contract, agreement, or partnership.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 3) (Range 0–6):				

Practical/Feasible Implementation

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Document provides detailed policy background or context.				
Gives detailed description of initiatives/activities.				
Sets clear guidelines as to how and when details of the document will be implemented (funding, reporting—e.g., RFP).				
Establishes guidelines for how to use or implement suggested policies, practices, initiatives, or activities (implementing product—e.g., IDESTE).				
There is a focus on sound educational research and practice.				
Has clearly defined plan to utilize respondent feedback results, such as guidelines for reviewing or evaluating work.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 6) (Range 0–12):				

Strengthen Teaching in the Content Areas

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Clearly defined strategies for building both content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge in mathematics, reading, writing, and science.				
Focus on curriculum alignment with national/state/district standards or performance indicators.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 2) (Range 0–4):				

Reform Teacher Education Programs Through Analysis of Candidates and Program Performance Data

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Clearly identifies which competencies, practices, courses, policies, or procedures need to be taught, assessed, or monitored.				
States specific minimum and/or maximum cut-off or acceptance criteria (i.e., cut-off scores; GPA, course credits).				
Establishes guidelines for reporting data on teacher candidates.				
Establishes clear strategies to help in the development of teacher educators.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 4) (Range 0-8):				

Raises Standards and/or Accountability for IHEs, Administrators, Students, or Teachers

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Requires clearly defined formative or summative strategies for tracking the effectiveness of work.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1) (Range 0–2):				

Professional Development

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Components of professional development are clearly aligned with state and national standards.				
Learning activities are clearly described and are relevant and rigorous.				
Establishes guidelines or strategies for ensuring that professional development translates into effective classroom strategies.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 3) (Range 0–6):				

Assessment

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Clearly defined strategies to evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of teacher education programs.				
Utilizes various tools (assessments, rubrics) to monitor the success of policies, programs, or initiatives.				
Use of multiple assessments for diagnostic and reteaching purposes.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 3) (Range 0–6):				